

We wish to reply to Roger Crosskey's comment (above) on our application. His proposal raises some interesting issues over what we thought would be a straightforward application. After considering his comments at some length we believe his proposal to be overly complex compared with ours. There are undoubtedly numerous solutions to this problem but we do not think that Crosskey's is the best one.

The basis of Crosskey's solution rests on the fact that Schletterer suspected *G. pedunculatum* and *F. unguiculatus* might be the same species. However, there is absolutely no validity in this and we are surprised that Crosskey gives it any credence — it is based on Schletterer's view of over 100 years ago. He had little or no understanding of the taxonomy of the group compared to present-day concepts: he probably did not inspect any specimens other than his own (of which he possibly had two), and hence relied on Westwood's description which was so brief as to be meaningless. If we were to propose such an artificial synonymy there would be a very good chance that we would be synonymising historically different species because the existing type of *G. pedunculatum* lacks the diagnostic genitalia to accurately associate it with any taxonomic species.

Crosskey is correct that we (Jennings & Austin, 1994) erroneously listed the specimen of *pedunculatus* as the holotype when there were apparently at least two syntypes, but the second specimen has never been located by any author since Schletterer. We have made an extensive attempt to find it, without success, including one of us visiting all likely European collections.

Our solution to the problem, designating *Foenus unguiculatus* Westwood, 1841 as the type species of *Pseudofoenus*, has the distinct advantage that the type species would be denoted by the oldest available name. Certainly the name *G. pedunculatum* would remain a nomen dubium but, since it is inevitably invalid as a junior synonym of either *F. unguiculatus* or of *F. crassipes* Smith, 1876, this presents no problem.

For this reason we firmly believe that Crosskey's approach is unnecessarily complicated.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the names *Labrus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Cichlasoma* Swainson, 1839 and *Polycentrus* Müller & Troschel, 1849 by the designation of neotypes for *Labrus bimaculatus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *L. punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Osteichthyes, Perciformes)**

(Cases 2880 and 2905; see BZN 50: 215–218 and 53: 106–111; 54: 106–116)

Hans-J. Paepke

*Naturhistorisches Forschungsinstitut, Museum für Naturkunde der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Invalidenstrasse 43, D-10115 Berlin, Germany*

In BZN 54: 109–115 (June 1997) Dr Sven Kullander has contributed a considerable number of interesting arguments to the discussion on the names *Labrus punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Polycentrus schomburgkii* Müller & Troschel, 1849. I cannot agree, however, with his suggestion that the proposals I made in Case 2880 (published in BZN 50: 215–218) should be set aside until a systematic revision of the genus *Polycentrus* has been carried out. I understand his endeavour to retain the Linnaean name *punctatus* but, since the well known name *schomburgkii* has been used in favour

of the completely disregarded senior name, and has remained unchallenged in use for 134 years (from 1849 to 1983), I wish to stand by my proposal to conserve the name *schomburgkii*. The nomenclatural stability of *schomburgkii* has been supported by Drs Fricke & Ferraris (Case 2905, published in 53: 106–111) and by Professor Reeve Bailey in his comment on these cases (BZN 54: 106–109).

Kullander (BZN 54: 110) doubts that the name *schomburgkii* merits protection. I have therefore surveyed the frequency with which the name has been used in the literature for Schomburgk's leaf fish in the last 50 years (1947–1997) compared with that of *punctatus*. Including the references which I cited in my application (BZN 50: 216, 217), I found that the name *schomburgkii* (sometimes incorrectly written '*schomburgki*') has been used as valid in at least 54 publications by 53 authors during that time (I have given a list to the Commission Secretariat). Kullander has already pointed out that the taxon is referred to in aquarium and behaviour articles and books, and the name is therefore well known to the public. Many of the popular science publications I have listed are in German; it is to be expected that there is additional literature in other languages. In contrast, the name *punctatus* has been used only by Kullander (1983), Nelson (1984) and Stawikowski (1992).

Referring in his comment (BZN 54: 110) to freshwater fish in Guiana, Kullander followed Kullander & Nijssen (1989) in recording that 'there is considerable diversity, with closely related species replacing each other in parallel river drainages'. It is thus of significance to note that the type locality of *P. schomburgkii* is the Essequibo river drainage in the former British Guiana, whilst the type locality of *Labrus punctatus* was given by Linnaeus (1758) as 'Surinami' in the former Dutch Guiana, another region of Guiana. It is conceivable that in the future *P. schomburgkii* and *L. punctatus* may turn out to be distinct taxa and in view of this I now propose to revise my application to request that the name *schomburgkii* Müller & Troschel, 1849 be given precedence over *punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758, rather than that *punctatus* be suppressed, so that the latter can continue to be of use, if required, as a specific or subspecific name. If this revised proposal is approved by the Commission both names will be placed on the Official List.

Kullander (BZN 54: 110, para. (4)) pointed out that '*L. punctatus* has been considered the type species of both *Polycentrus* Müller & Troschel, 1849 and *Cichlasoma* Swainson, 1839'. Under the Code (Article 68), *P. schomburgkii* is, of course, the type species of *Polycentrus* and has been cited as such by Kullander (1983, p. 84), Eschmeyer & Bailey (1990, p. 325), and Fricke & Ferraris in their application (BZN 53: 107).

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to use its plenary powers to rule that the specific name *schomburgkii* Müller & Troschel, 1849, as published in the binomen *Polycentrus schomburgkii*, is to be given precedence over the name *punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Labrus punctatus*;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
  - (a) *schomburgkii* Müller & Troschel, 1849, as published in the binomen *Polycentrus schomburgkii* and as defined by the syntypes in the Zoological Museum of the Humboldt-University of Berlin, with the endorsement that it is to be given precedence over the name *punctatus* Linnaeus, 1758, as